

MIGRANT EDUCATION

Goal: To assist migrant students reach challenging standards.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Office of Migrant Education (OME) is designed to help migrant students reach high standards. It addresses the Department's Objective 2.4 (that special populations participate in appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards), and Objective 1.5 (that families and communities be fully involved in meeting this goal).

FY 2000—\$354,689,000

FY 2001—\$380,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ALONG WITH OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND STATE AND LOCAL REFORM EFFORTS, THE MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM (MEP) WILL CONTRIBUTE TO IMPROVED SCHOOL PERFORMANCE OF MIGRANT CHILDREN.

Indicator 1.1 State and local assessments: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students will meet or exceed the basic and proficient levels in state and local assessments (where in place).

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Reading elementary</i>			Status: (a) In 1997-98, 7 of the 15 reporting states showed at least 50 percent of their migrant students scoring at or above the proficient level in reading, both in elementary and middle grade testing; (b) 9 of 15 states showed at least 50 percent of their migrant students scoring at or above the proficient level in math in elementary grade testing, while 7 of 15 reported the same in middle grade testing. These scores show improvement since 1996-97, when (a) 4 of 10 states reported at least 50 percent of their migrant students scored at or above the proficient level in reading in elementary grade testing and 2 of 10 in middle grade testing; and (b) 4 of 10 states reported at least 50 percent of their migrant students scored at or above the proficient level in math in elementary grade testing and 3 of 10 reported the same in middle grade testing. Explanation: It is likely that progress has been made because states are paying greater attention to migrant students' achievement. The requirement that all states disaggregate assessment results by migrant status has meant that states are now measuring migrant students' performance, and are therefore monitoring it, in many cases for the first time. <ul style="list-style-type: none">Only 15 states reported assessment scores for migrant students by achievement levels.	Source: Tabulations from the Council of Chief States School Officers State Education Indicators Report, 1999, and Council of Chief States School Officers State Education Indicators Report, 1998. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 1998-99 data will be available February 2001. Validation Procedure: Data is validated by internal review procedures of the Council of Chief State School Officers, an experienced data collection contractor. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: OME has described, through ED's data attestation process, the limitations of this indicator. The following are some of the limitations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">While mean percentages can be calculated across the reporting states for broad categories of proficiency, they will be highly unreliable. This is because (a) reporting categories are not standardized, and (b) sample sizes are small and likely unrepresentative and thus imprecise.Until data precision is increased substantially, gains will be both difficult to detect and difficult to interpret. Improvements will be addressed in OME's 2000 Data Improvement Plan.	
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	Percent at or Above Proficient	Number of States			
1996-97:	50%	4 (of 10)			
1997-98:	50%	7 (of 15)			
1998-99:	No data available				Continuing increase
1999-00:					Continuing increase
2000-01:			Continuing increase		
<i>Reading middle</i>					
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	Percent at or Above Proficient	Number of States			
1996-97:	50%	2 (of 10)			
1997-98:	50%	7 (of 15)			
1998-99:	No data available				Continuing increase
1999-00:					Continuing increase
2000-01:			Continuing increase		
<i>Math elementary</i>					
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	Percent at or Above Proficient	Number of States			
1996-97:	50%	4			
1997-98:	50%	9			
1998-99:	No data available				Continuing increase
1999-00:					Continuing increase
2000-01:			Continuing increase		

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Math middle</i>				<ul style="list-style-type: none">States are not required to disaggregate statewide achievement data by migrant status until 2001. The year 1996-97 was the first year disaggregated data were available for at least two of the three states serving the greatest number of migrant students.Future reports will be able to compare migrant students' performance to other students in their state.	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	Percent at or Above proficient	Number of States			
1996-97:	50%	3 (of 10)			
1997-98:	50%	7 (of 15)			
1998-99:	No data available		Continuing increase		
1999-00:			Continuing increase		
2000-01:			Continuing increase		
Indicator 1.2 Improved attention to assessment of migrant children: The number of states that include migrant students in state assessments linked to high standards will increase, reaching all states that receive Migrant Education Program (MEP) funds in 2001.					
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of states and territories that included migrant students in their state assessment reports</i>				Status: The number of states disaggregating the results of statewide assessment data is increasing.	Source: Council of Chief States School Officers State Education Indicators Report, 1999. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> February 2001.
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
1995-96:	11			Explanation: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The number is required by the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 to reach 52 by 2001.	Validation Procedure: Data is validated by internal review procedures of Council of Chief State School Officers, an experienced data collection contractor. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: OME has described, through ED's data attestation process, the limitations inherent in this indicator. Primarily, the number of states will soon reach its maximum value of 52, and this is a limited measure of states' inclusion of migrant students in state assessments since we don't know what percentage of migrant students are included. Improvements will be addressed in OME's data improvement plan.
1996-97:	15				
1997-98:	19				
1998-99:	No data available		Continuing increase		
1999-00:			Continuing increase		
2000-01:			52		

OBJECTIVE 2: STATES AND LOCAL DISTRICTS WILL PROVIDE EDUCATION SERVICES OUTSIDE THE REGULAR SCHOOL TERM TO HELP MIGRANT STUDENTS ACHIEVE TO HIGH STANDARDS.

Indicator 2.1 Summer education participation: Summer and intersession programs offer states and districts a way to help compensate for interruptions in learning caused by student mobility. States will demonstrate an increased emphasis on helping migrant students reach high standards by serving an increasing number in summer and intersession programs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Numbers of summer and intersession participants			Status: The number of migrant students participating in summer sessions continues to increase.	Source: MEP State Performance Report, 1999. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2001 (1998-99 Consolidated State Performance Report).
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1995-96:	220,793			
1996-97:	283,026			
1997-98:	312,415			

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Explanation: Research shows that extended time, including summer instruction, helps close the achievement gap between children from low-income families and others. With this indicator, OME knows that an increasing number of migrant students are receiving supplemental instruction, but we don't know definitively whether the instruction is helping to close the achievement gap for migrant students. We also do not know the extent to which summer and intersession programs meet migrant students' instructional needs.	Validation Procedure: Data is validated by internal review procedures of Westat, an experienced data collection contractor. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: This is not an outcome measure; we don't know how summer programs are affecting migrant students. We also don't know whether summer programs are of high quality or if there is a difference in outcomes between high- and low-quality summer programs. OME will determine the feasibility of creating an indicator that can distinguish between (a) research-based, high-quality summer and intersession programs that respond proportionately to the problem of instructional continuity and (b) poor-quality programs. OME's goal will be to create better process measures to help us understand what promotes student achievement. This will be addressed in OME's data improvement plan.
1998-99:	No data available	Continuing increase		
1999-00:		Continuing increase		
2000-01:		Continuing increase		

Indicator 2.2 Extended learning opportunities: The number of migrant out-of-school youth served during summer, intersession, and extended-time programs will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Out-of-school youth served in summer programs			Status: The number of out-of-school migrant youth participating in summer programs continues to increase. Explanation: Although more out-of-school youth are receiving supplemental instruction in summer programs, OME does not know the extent to which their participation promotes positive outcomes (e.g., increasing the likelihood that an out-of-school migrant youth reenters school).	Source: MEP State Performance Report, 1999. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2001. Validation Procedure: Data is validated by internal review procedures of Westat, an experienced data collection contractor. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Same as Indicator 2.1.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1995-96:	7,593			
1996-97:	13,504			
1997- 98:	14,297			
1998-99:	No data available	Continuing increase		
1999-00:		Continuing increase		
2000-01:		Continuing increase		

OBJECTIVE 3: THE MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM (MEP) WILL INCREASE THE EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF SERVICES TO MIGRANT CHILDREN THROUGH MORE EFFECTIVE COORDINATION AT THE STATE LEVEL.

Indicator 3.1 Family access to information: The number of migrant families using the toll-free number will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of toll-free calls</i>			Status: Progress toward target. Explanation: The increase is a result of an intensified public awareness campaign and working more closely with growers.	Source: Usage reports from toll-free number coordination contract. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997-98:	10,717			
1998-99:	13,311			
1998-99:	No data available	Continuing increase		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		<p>Validation Procedure: Data supplied by outside contractor; no formal verification procedure was applied.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: These data measure access to information but not the quality of information received, nor the satisfaction of customers with that information.</p> <p>OME has asked the contractor to break phone calls out by category of information requested. It must be noted that the number of calls does not correspond with the number of families making calls.</p>
1999-00:		Continuing increase		
2000-01:		Continuing increase		

Objective 4: ENCOURAGE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES.

Indicator 4.1 Schools serving migrant students will encourage and facilitate the participation of migrant parents in their children's education.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of sampled principals reporting progress in school-parent compacts with migrant parents			Status: Unable to judge. Explanation: According to the National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 68.8 percent of a sample of principals of schools that enroll migrant students report that their school monitors the progress of the school-parent compact through records of involvement of parents of migrant students. This sample represents those NLSS principals who have migrants in their school, provide parent-school compacts to parents, and monitor whether parents have met their part of the compact. The second data point will not be available until 2001.	Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999. <i>Frequency:</i> Two school surveys. <i>Next Update:</i> 2001. Validation Procedure: Data validated by NCES review procedure and NCES Statistical Standards. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Available data address schools, not states.• Addressing this objective on an ongoing basis will require special studies that sample migrant students and families.• This issue will be addressed in OME's 2000 Data Improvement Plan.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998-99:	68.8%	Continuing increase		
1999-00:		Continuing increase		
2000-01:		Continuing increase		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- ❖ Encourage states to coordinate their assessment procedures so migrant children are included in state assessments that are linked to high standards.
- ❖ Examine assessment data from states that can disaggregate data by migrant status.
- ❖ Encourage states and districts to establish summer programs, intersession programs, and extended day and school year programs for migrant children.
- ❖ Encourage states and districts to identify out-of-school migrant youth.
- ❖ Encourage states to form multistate consortia to develop materials and implement procedures for use across multiple states.

KEY STRATEGIES (CONTINUED)**New or Strengthened Strategies**

- ❖ Support development and use of locator software to facilitate searches of state and regional databases to find and update records on migrant children.
- ❖ Establish and maintain substantive relationships with other Federal programs, including Migrant Health (HHS) and Migrant Labor (JTPA).
- ❖ Provide technical assistance, through site visits, policy letters, meeting presentations, and other methods of communication, to better coordinate services to migrant students across programs.
- ❖ Establish schoolwide programs at schools enrolling migrant children, and encourage the blending of Migrant Education Program (MEP) funds and services with other program funds so that migrant children can benefit more fully.
- ❖ Encourage states and schools to encourage full participation and inclusion of migrant parents in the education of their children.
- ❖ Encourage states and districts to work with agribusiness and other local organizations to support education services and the work of migrant families and workers.
- ❖ Encourage states and districts to work with Title I, Part A, staff to include migrant parents in the Title I, Part A, outreach activities authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).
- ❖ Develop and implement a plan, called the Office of Migrant Education's 2000 Data Improvement Plan, to address data quality issues.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

N/A.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- ❖ The most significant challenge is implementation of comprehensive, standards-based school reform that (a) can accommodate highly mobile students and (b) includes migrant and the Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students within the State Education Agency (SEA) and Local Education Agency (LEA) accountability systems.

INDICATOR CHANGES**From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)**

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- ❖ Indicators 3.1, 3.3, 4.2, and 4.3 were dropped because they were not meaningful measures.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—None.